

Buddhism, Consciousness, and Quantum Physics: A Review and Refutation in Light of the Logos-Centred Metaphysic.

S C SAYLES

Abstract

David Leong's *The Intersectionality Between Buddhism, Consciousness, and Quantum Physics* (2023) proposes a dialogue between Mahāyāna Buddhist philosophy and modern quantum mechanics. He argues that Buddhist notions such as *pratītya-samutpāda* (dependent origination), *śūnyatā* (emptiness), and *Dharmakāya* (truth-body) resonate with phenomena in physics such as entanglement, superposition, and the quantum vacuum. His ambition is to forge a holistic paradigm that unites science and spirituality.

This paper reviews Leong's study in detail, exposing internal logical tensions and epistemological missteps, while also situating his work within a broader comparative framework. Against Leong's Buddhist-quantum synthesis, the Logos-centred metaphysic of S. C. Sayles offers a coherent alternative: reality is not emptiness but informational authorship in the eternal Logos; personhood is not an illusion but an eternal creation in the imago Dei; and the cosmos is not cyclical dissolution but teleological consummation in Christ.

Through detailed textual analysis, philosophical critique, and theological refutation, this paper demonstrates that Leong's synthesis, while rhetorically engaging, collapses under logical and ontological scrutiny, whereas Sayles's Logos-centred framework offers a more coherent and enduring account of consciousness, science, and meaning.

Introduction

The relationship between Eastern spiritual traditions and modern physics has been a recurring fascination in 20th- and 21st-century discourse. From Fritjof Capra's *The Tao of Physics* (1975) to Matthieu Ricard and Trinh Xuan Thuan's *The Quantum and the Lotus* (2009), scholars and popular writers alike have explored resonances between Buddhist thought and quantum mechanics. At stake is not only intellectual curiosity but also the hope of developing a new holistic worldview that unites empirical science with contemplative wisdom.

David Leong's 2023 preprint joins this conversation by arguing for deep parallels between Buddhist metaphysics and quantum phenomena. The

paper is ambitious in scope: it traverses Buddhist cosmology, the Heart Sutra, the twelve nidānas, Thích Nhất Hạnh's "interbeing," and contemporary developments in quantum field theory. Its central thesis is that Buddhism and quantum mechanics converge on a vision of interdependence, relationality, and non-duality.

Yet, as with similar attempts, serious difficulties emerge. Does Leong maintain categorical distinctions between metaphor and ontology? Does his synthesis withstand logical analysis? And, crucially, what happens to questions of personhood, meaning, and ultimate reality?

This study offers a comprehensive review and critique of Leong's work, structured around three levels:

1. **Review** – A detailed exposition of Leong's central claims and their conceptual background.
2. **Critique and Refutation** – Identification of internal contradictions, logical errors, and category mistakes, with counter-arguments drawn from philosophy and theology.
3. **Comparative Framework** – A contrast with the Logos-centred metaphysic of S. C. Sayles, whose vision of the Information Field (IAF), the Second Shamay, and the imago Dei provides a robust alternative.

In what follows, each section expands upon these aims, culminating in an extended argument for the superiority of a Logos-centred ontology over a Buddhist-quantum synthesis.

Review of Leong's Central Claims

Buddhism and Dependent Origination

At the heart of Leong's paper is the Buddhist concept of *pratītya-samutpāda*—dependent origination—which asserts that all phenomena arise in dependence upon causes and conditions. Leong identifies this with quantum entanglement: just as particles exhibit inseparability across distance (Aspect, 1976; Pan et al., 2001), so too phenomena in Buddhism lack intrinsic existence and emerge relationally.

Emptiness and the Quantum Vacuum

A second key parallel is drawn between *śūnyatā* (emptiness) and the quantum vacuum. In Buddhist philosophy, *śūnyatā* signifies the absence of independent, inherent essence. In quantum physics, the vacuum is not empty but a seething ground of fluctuating energy (Aitchison, 1985;

Milonni & Shih, 1991). Leong suggests that both point to a fertile “nothingness” from which phenomena arise and into which they dissolve.

Dharmakāya and Non-Locality

Leong further aligns the Buddhist *Dharmakāya*—the “truth body” of ultimate reality—with the wholeness and non-locality articulated in Bohm’s interpretation of quantum mechanics (Bohm, 2002). The *Dharmakāya*, as the ultimate, unmanifest reality, is likened to the unified quantum field.

Consciousness and the Observer Effect

Perhaps most provocatively, Leong equates *viññāna* (consciousness) with the observer effect in quantum mechanics. He interprets the collapse of the wave function as a scientific parallel to Buddhist insight into the constructed nature of perception. Consciousness is not an isolated self but an interdependent process that co-creates reality.

Soteriological and Ethical Implications

Finally, Leong connects these metaphors to Buddhist soteriology. Just as quantum systems reveal an underlying unity, so Buddhist practice reveals the emptiness of self and the possibility of liberation. The ethical implication is “interbeing” (Nhat Hanh, 1996, 2020): compassion, mindfulness, and collective responsibility.

Category Confusion and Ontological Collapse

Leong’s study is ambitious in attempting to link the subtle metaphysics of Mahāyāna Buddhism with the counter-intuitive realities of quantum physics. Yet his comparisons suffer from a persistent and ultimately fatal problem: **category confusion**. By treating Buddhist soteriological concepts as if they were ontological entities equivalent to physical processes, the argument collapses into incoherence.

Śūnyatā and the Quantum Vacuum

The first and most obvious example is the conflation of *śūnyatā* (emptiness) with the quantum vacuum. Leong states that “*śūnyatā* is akin to the quantum void, a state of emptiness devoid of independent, inherent existence, analogous to the dimensionless void in quantum mechanics” (Leong, 2023, p. 11).

This claim falters for two reasons:

- **Philosophical category error:** In Buddhism, emptiness (*śūnyatā*) is not a substrate. It is a negation of essence, a refusal to posit

svabhāva (inherent existence). It functions as a logical middle way between substantialism and nihilism (Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*). To interpret emptiness as a "field" or "ground" is to misrepresent its very nature.

- **Scientific misrepresentation:** In quantum field theory, the vacuum is not empty but the lowest-energy state of a field (Aitchison, 1985; Milonni & Shih, 1991). It is brimming with fluctuations and virtual particles. Equating this with emptiness suggests that emptiness is a dynamic ground of being, when in fact *śūnyatā* denies precisely such substantial grounding.

The result is ontological confusion: emptiness is turned into a positive substrate, undermining its own definition.

Dharmakāya and Non-Locality

Leong also aligns *Dharmakāya*—the "truth body" of ultimate reality—with quantum non-locality. His claim is that just as entangled particles remain interconnected across distance, so the *Dharmakāya* represents an omnipresent unity permeating all existence.

Here again, the comparison stumbles:

- **Dharmakāya as soteriological, not physical:** In Buddhist thought, *Dharmakāya* is not a measurable field but the ineffable reality of Buddhahood, the transcendental truth realized through enlightenment. To treat it as if it were a scientific analogue to the quantum field is to reduce its soteriological role to physical metaphor.
- **Non-locality as formal, not mystical:** Quantum non-locality is not a mystical unity but a mathematically demonstrable correlation between entangled states (Aspect, 1976). It does not imply a universal "oneness" but rather a breakdown of classical separability. To import metaphysical holism into this framework is a leap from physics into theology without justification.

Observer Effect and Consciousness

Leong's most ambitious analogy is between the quantum observer effect and Buddhist *viññāna* (consciousness). He suggests that just as observation collapses the wave function, consciousness constructs reality through dependent origination.

The problem lies in conflating **measurement** with **awareness**. In quantum mechanics, the observer effect does not require a conscious mind; it requires any interaction with a measuring device that forces

decoherence (Bouwmeester & Zeilinger, 2000). Consciousness is not part of the formalism. To equate human awareness with the mathematical act of state reduction is therefore a categorical error.

This confusion has long been critiqued in the philosophy of physics. As Jansen (2015) observes, “to introduce consciousness into the collapse postulate is not required by the theory and introduces unnecessary metaphysical baggage.” Leong, however, reintroduces precisely this baggage in order to preserve the Buddhist analogy.

Collapse into Ontological Incoherence

By conflating *śūnyatā* with the vacuum, *Dharmakāya* with non-locality, and *vijñāna* with wave-function collapse, Leong creates a hybrid system that is neither Buddhist nor scientific. The result is an ontological incoherence in which emptiness becomes substance, non-locality becomes mystical unity, and measurement becomes mind.

In short, the study fails to maintain the categorical distinctions that both traditions demand. Buddhism requires emptiness to be non-substantial; physics requires non-locality to remain formal and testable. By collapsing them into each other, Leong undermines the integrity of both.

Internal Logical Contradictions

While category confusion undermines the foundations of Leong’s argument, a second layer of difficulty emerges from its **internal logical contradictions**. His study frequently vacillates between incompatible positions—affirming *śūnyatā* (emptiness) as negation while simultaneously endorsing holistic unity through *Dharmakāya* and quantum wholeness. The result is a paradox that neither Buddhism nor physics can sustain.

The Tension Between Emptiness and Wholeness

Leong draws heavily on Mahāyāna Buddhism’s doctrine of emptiness: phenomena lack intrinsic essence; the self is an illusion; reality is contingent and interdependent. Yet, at the same time, he appeals to Bohm’s (2002) implicate order and to *Dharmakāya* as symbols of indivisible unity.

- **Emptiness:** In Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, *śūnyatā* is precisely the denial of substance. It is the “emptiness of emptiness”—a logical tool to avoid both eternalism and nihilism. Nothing has *svabhāva*.

- **Wholeness:** Bohm's wholeness, by contrast, is realist. It posits an underlying order that enfolds all phenomena in a unified field. Similarly, Leong describes *Dharmakāya* as "the omnipresent, pervading essence of all phenomena" (Leong, 2023, p. 7).

These two positions cannot both be held consistently. To affirm emptiness is to deny the very ground that wholeness presupposes. To affirm wholeness is to reify what emptiness denies. Leong's attempt to hold both simultaneously collapses into contradiction.

Samsara as Fluctuation and Nirvana as Equilibrium

Leong draws an extended analogy between the cycle of *saṃsāra* and quantum fluctuations. Just as virtual particles emerge and annihilate in the vacuum, beings are born, die, and are reborn. Likewise, he compares Nirvana to the restoration of equilibrium when fluctuations return to the vacuum (Leong, 2023, p. 11).

The difficulty is twofold:

- **Trivialization of soteriology:** In Buddhism, Nirvana is not merely a return to equilibrium but the cessation of craving, ignorance, and karmic bondage. To equate it with energetic balance reduces liberation to a physical state, stripping it of its ethical and existential depth.
- **Philosophical incoherence:** If *śūnyatā* truly means emptiness of essence, then both fluctuation and equilibrium lack inherent existence. To speak of Nirvana as "restoring balance" presupposes a ground of being that emptiness denies.

Thus, Leong both negates and presupposes substance in the same argument, oscillating between nihilism and realism without resolution.

The Observer as Both Constructive and Illusory

Leong also vacillates in his treatment of consciousness. On the one hand, he insists that *viññāna* is interdependent and illusory, lacking inherent existence. On the other, he ascribes to consciousness a constructive role in shaping reality, analogous to the observer effect in quantum mechanics.

This yields a contradiction:

- If consciousness is an illusion, it cannot construct reality.
- If consciousness constructs reality, it cannot itself be merely illusory.

Buddhism resolves this tension through a soteriological move: consciousness is conventional truth, not ultimate truth. But Leong's

attempt to press this into dialogue with physics blurs the distinction, creating a logical inconsistency.

Collapse Into Paradox

These contradictions result in an unstable framework. Emptiness is posited but undermined by wholeness; Nirvana is spiritual but reduced to physics; consciousness is illusory but also constructive. The system cannot hold together without collapsing into paradox.

As Schaeffer (1968) warned of Eastern monism: “If all is one, then the distinctions that make rational discourse possible are dissolved. One cannot speak of truth or falsehood, for these presuppose difference.” Leong’s model falls into precisely this dilemma.

In contrast, as we shall see, Sayles’s Logos-centred metaphysic preserves both **unity and distinction**: the cosmos is authored by the Logos, ensuring coherence, but creatures are distinct, ensuring personal identity. Where Leong collapses into paradox, Sayles maintains ontological balance.

The Problem of Personhood

Beyond category errors and contradictions, the most profound difficulty in Leong’s synthesis lies in its **treatment of human personhood**. By merging Buddhist *anātman* (non-self) with quantum indeterminacy, the study erodes the very grounds for identity, agency, and moral responsibility. This is not simply a doctrinal concern but a philosophical and existential one: can a system that denies enduring personhood sustain meaning at all?

The Buddhist Doctrine of Anātman

In classical Buddhist thought, the doctrine of *anātman* denies the existence of a permanent, unchanging self. What we call “self” is but the aggregation of the five skandhas: form (*rūpa*), sensation (*vedanā*), perception (*saṃjñā*), mental formations (*saṃskāra*), and consciousness (*vijñāna*). Each is impermanent, contingent, and devoid of *svabhāva* (inherent essence).

The soteriological function of this teaching is to liberate beings from clinging to an illusory self. To realize non-self is to break the chains of craving and thereby move toward Nirvana.

Leong’s Extension into Quantum Indeterminacy

Leong extends this doctrine into the quantum domain. Just as the self lacks inherent existence, so particles lack determinate properties until observed. Both dissolve into interdependence: the person into aggregates, the particle into probabilities.

On the surface, this analogy appears elegant. Yet it raises a fundamental issue:

- If both self and matter lack enduring essence, what remains to ground identity or continuity?
- If human consciousness is merely a fluctuation within an interdependent field, how can moral agency or responsibility survive?

The Erasure of Moral Agency

By erasing the substantial self, Leong's synthesis risks eroding moral accountability. If the self is but a bundle of aggregates, constantly dissolving and reforming, then the agent of moral action is never more than a temporary construct. Responsibility dissolves into flux.

This concern is not merely Christian polemic. Even within Buddhist studies, scholars such as Collins (1982) have noted the difficulty of reconciling *anātman* with the continuity of karma. If there is no enduring self, who reaps the fruit of action? The tradition resolves this pragmatically through the chain of dependent origination (*pratītya-samutpāda*), but philosophically the tension remains unresolved.

Leong, by importing quantum indeterminacy into this picture, intensifies rather than resolves the difficulty. He transforms the self into a probabilistic event, further undermining any sense of stable identity.

The Crisis of Meaning

The anthropological crisis in Leong's synthesis extends beyond morality to the very question of meaning. If selfhood is illusory and consciousness is but a fluctuation, then:

- What grounds hope?
- What anchors dignity?
- What ensures continuity beyond dissolution?

Without enduring personhood, human existence risks becoming a fleeting ripple in an ocean of emptiness. Such a view may foster detachment, but it cannot sustain the deep human longings for justice, love, and immortality.

Contrast with S. C. Sayles — The Second Shamay and the Imago Dei

Here the contrast with Sayles's Logos-centred anthropology is decisive.

- **Second Shamay:** Sayles (2023) insists that each soul is authored in the act of creation (Gen. 1:27), uniquely instantiated in what he calls the *Second Shamay*—a higher-dimensional realm of the soul. Unlike the Buddhist aggregates, the human soul is not recycled, dissolved, or illusory. It endures eternally as the personal, informational identity of each human being.
- **Imago Dei:** Personhood is not a passing construct but grounded in the *imago Dei*. Each soul reflects the Logos, bearing dignity, agency, and accountability.
- **Teleology:** Rather than dissolving into emptiness, the soul is destined for consummation in union with Christ, the Logos who redeems creation.

This anthropology sustains moral desert, human rights, and eschatological hope. By affirming that “identity is authored, grounded in the Logos, and sustained eternally” (Sayles, *Veritas Confirmata*, 2023), Sayles avoids the nihilistic drift of Buddhist-quantum synthesis.

Implications

The erasure of personhood is not a minor side effect of Leong's model; it is its deepest flaw. Without a self, there is no subject of salvation, no agent of morality, no bearer of meaning. Sayles's Logos-centred metaphysic restores these foundations, affirming both the interconnectedness glimpsed in physics and the irreducible dignity of the soul.

Sayles's Logos-Centred Metaphysic

S. C. Sayles has developed, across *The Recovery of the Soul* (2023), the *Veritas Confirmata* series (2023–25), and his works on time (*Chronos, Kairos, Time and Times*), a comprehensive metaphysical system that is at once theological, philosophical, and informational. Unlike Leong, who attempts to merge Buddhist non-self with quantum indeterminacy, Sayles grounds reality in the eternal Logos, who is both the author of the cosmos and the sustainer of meaning. This framework can be outlined under four interlocking themes: **ontology, epistemology, anthropology, and teleology**.

1. Ontology: Logos as Author, IΔF as Field

At the heart of Sayles's metaphysic is the proposition:

Reality is not material but informational, authored and sustained by the eternal Logos. (Veritas Confirmata, 2023).

This ontology reframes existence not as emptiness (*śūnyatā*) but as authored information. The cosmos is structured through the Information Field (IAF), an ontological metaphysical substrate that parallels, but transcends, physical fields.

- **Against Leong:** Whereas Leong equates emptiness with the quantum vacuum, Sayles insists that information is authored. The vacuum itself is patterned by the Logos; its fluctuations are not self-existent but derivative.
- **Strength:** This avoids the collapse of emptiness into substance and preserves coherence between physics and metaphysics.

2. Epistemology: Revelation and Participation

Sayles, drawing from Van Til (1955) and Schaeffer (1968), asserts that knowledge is analogical, derived from God's self-revelation. Human cognition participates in the Logos, rather than autonomously constructing reality.

- **Against Leong:** Leong portrays consciousness as a co-constructor of reality, collapsing into the observer-effect confusion. Sayles instead locates human knowing in covenantal participation: our minds image the Logos, who is the true ground of order.
- **Implication:** This epistemology preserves truth as correspondence to divine revelation, avoiding relativism or solipsism.

3. Anthropology: The Second Shamay and the Imago Dei

Sayles's anthropology is radically different from Buddhist *anātman*.

- **Second Shamay:** Each soul is uniquely authored in creation (Gen. 1:27), instantiated in the Second Shamay — a higher-dimensional realm distinct from both material reality and the divine essence.
- **Imago Dei:** This ensures that personhood is not illusory but eternal, bearing dignity and moral agency.

- **Continuity:** Unlike Buddhist aggregates that dissolve, the soul endures, preserving identity across life, death, and resurrection.

This doctrine resolves the problem of moral agency that haunts Leong's synthesis.

4. Teleology: Redemption in Christ the Logos

Whereas Leong reduces liberation (*nirvāṇa*) to equilibrium within a quantum field, Sayles situates salvation in the eschatological consummation of all things in Christ.

- **Liberation** is not extinction but transformation.
- **Hope** is not dissolution into emptiness but union with the Logos.
- **Cosmic destiny** is not cyclical but linear, moving from creation to consummation.

This eschatological trajectory avoids the nihilistic implications of Buddhist-quantum synthesis and sustains the deep human longing for justice, reconciliation, and eternal life.

Comparative Synthesis

We may now contrast the two frameworks across core categories:

Category	Leong's Synthesis	Sayles's Logos Metaphysic
Ontology	Emptiness as fertile vacuum; Dharmakāya as field	Logos authors IΔF; creation is informational, authored
Epistemology	Consciousness co-creates via observer effect	Knowledge is participatory, grounded in revelation
Anthropology	Self is illusory; aggregates dissolve	Soul endures, imago Dei affirms dignity
Teleology	Nirvana as equilibrium in quantum balance	Consummation in Christ, eternal destiny in the Logos

The contrast is stark. Leong's synthesis erases personhood, while Sayles's preserves it. Leong collapses into contradiction between emptiness and wholeness, while Sayles sustains unity-in-distinction.

Implications for Dialogue

This comparative framework suggests that fruitful dialogue between physics and spirituality requires more than metaphor. It requires a metaphysic that can integrate science without erasing personhood. Sayles's Logos-centred model does precisely this. It affirms the insights of

interconnectedness that Leong seeks but grounds them in the personal and triune Logos, rather than in impersonal emptiness.

Philosophical and Theological Refutation

Leong's Buddhist-quantum synthesis raises not only internal contradictions but also deep philosophical and theological problems. His framework undermines the very preconditions of rationality, morality, and metaphysical coherence. By contrast, classical Christian thought — from Augustine and Calvin to Van Til, Schaeffer, and Sayles — provides a more stable foundation.

Refutation from Internal Logic

The most immediate refutation of Leong's synthesis comes from its own contradictions.

- **Emptiness vs. Wholeness:** To claim that all is empty (*śūnyatā*) and simultaneously unified in *Dharmakāya* is logically incoherent. One cannot deny intrinsic essence while positing a universal ground.
- **Consciousness as Illusory and Constructive:** If *vijñāna* is an illusion, it cannot construct reality. If it constructs reality, it cannot be merely illusory.

By affirming both positions, the system collapses into paradox. Logical consistency requires a framework in which unity and distinction coexist without erasure — precisely what Sayles's Logos ontology provides.

Refutation from Philosophy

Philosophically, Leong's synthesis resonates with what Schaeffer (1968) warned against in *The God Who Is There*: Eastern monism dissolves the very categories necessary for thought. If all is one (or all is empty), then the distinction between true and false collapses. Rational discourse becomes impossible.

Van Til (1955) sharpened this point: all systems that begin from autonomous human reasoning (or from impersonal metaphysics such as emptiness) end in irrationalism. Only when thought is grounded in the self-revealing Logos can rationality be preserved. Leong's system, by contrast, ends in relativism, where truth is reduced to perspective and identity to illusion.

Refutation from Theology

From a theological standpoint, Leong's framework is incompatible with biblical revelation at every level.

- **Creation:** Scripture declares, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). Reality is not eternal emptiness but a created order authored by the triune God.
- **Personhood:** Humanity is made “in the image of God” (Gen. 1:27). The self is not an illusion but an eternal soul with dignity and destiny.
- **Consciousness:** The mind is not a fluctuation but a created faculty designed for communion with God (Calvin, *Institutes*, I.xv.2).
- **Salvation:** Liberation is not extinction into Nirvana but reconciliation through Christ (John 1:14; Col. 1:16–20).

Thus, to embrace Leong’s model would be to reject the very foundations of biblical anthropology and soteriology.

Refutation from Sayles’s Logos-Centred Metaphysic

Sayles extends these theological insights into a metaphysical system capable of engaging with modern science.

- **Ontology:** The Information Field (IΔF) explains interconnectedness without erasing substance. Unlike *śūnyatā*, it affirms reality as authored.
- **Epistemology:** Knowledge is covenantal, not autonomous. This avoids the relativism of Buddhist-quantum epistemology.
- **Anthropology:** The Second Shamay provides the higher-dimensional realm in which personal identity is secured beyond dissolution. Within this created domain, each soul is uniquely authored, enduring, and morally accountable.
- **Teleology:** Cosmic destiny is not cyclical dissolution but eschatological consummation in Christ the Logos.

In this way, Sayles avoids both nihilism and pantheism, grounding science and spirituality alike in the eternal Word.

Refutation from Eschatology and Hope

Perhaps the sharpest contrast lies in destiny.

- **Leong's Model:** Liberation is dissolution. The self dissolves into emptiness; Nirvana is equilibrium. Hope is negation.
- **Sayles's Model:** Salvation is consummation. The self is preserved, redeemed, and glorified in union with Christ. Hope is fulfillment.

One system ends in the erasure of personhood; the other ends in its perfection.

Broader Implications

The dialogue between Buddhism and quantum physics is not a merely speculative exercise. It shapes how we interpret science, how we understand human existence, and how we approach ultimate questions of meaning and destiny. Leong's synthesis, though intellectually creative, has consequences that reverberate far beyond its immediate claims. When contrasted with Sayles's Logos-centred metaphysic, the implications for each domain become stark.

Implications for Science

Leong's model risks undermining the integrity of scientific inquiry by importing metaphysical commitments that distort the meaning of empirical results.

- **Observer Effect Misuse:** To suggest that human consciousness collapses the wave function reintroduces a form of mystical idealism into physics that the discipline itself does not require. Measurement theory does not demand a conscious observer but only physical interaction (Bouwmeester & Zeilinger, 2000). By inserting awareness into the formalism, Leong collapses physics into psychology.
- **Equating Emptiness with Vacuum:** Treating *śūnyatā* as equivalent to quantum vacuum risks conflating a logical negation with an energetic state. This encourages pseudoscientific appropriations, where metaphors are taken as ontology.
- **Loss of Predictive Clarity:** Science thrives on distinction, measurement, and predictive rigor. If all is interdependence without substance, the very basis for controlled inquiry erodes.

By contrast, Sayles's Logos framework does not undermine science but undergirds it. The Information Field (IAF) accounts for why the universe is rational and coherent: because it is authored by the Logos. Scientific laws are reliable not because of emptiness but because they are reflections of divine order. This restores to science both integrity and metaphysical grounding.

Implications for Philosophy

Philosophically, Leong's synthesis tends toward **nihilism**.

- If all is empty, then distinctions collapse.
- If distinctions collapse, truth and falsehood lose meaning.
- If truth collapses, reason disintegrates into paradox.

This was precisely Van Til's warning: non-Christian systems end either in rationalism (false autonomy) or irrationalism (self-destruction). Leong's system tends toward the latter.

By contrast, Sayles's Logos ontology sustains **unity and distinction simultaneously**. Reality is unified because it is authored by the Logos; yet it preserves distinction because creation is not identical with God. This balance allows philosophy to retain coherence, avoiding both nihilism and pantheism.

Implications for Theology

The theological consequences are decisive.

- **God:** In Leong's synthesis, there is no Creator, only interdependence. The divine is impersonal emptiness. By contrast, Sayles affirms the triune Logos as personal Creator and Sustainer.
- **Humanity:** In Leong's model, humanity has no enduring self; identity dissolves into aggregates. In Sayles's, each soul is authored, eternal, and dignified in the imago Dei.
- **Salvation:** In Leong's framework, salvation is extinction — Nirvana as dissolution into equilibrium. In Sayles's, salvation is consummation — eternal communion with Christ.

Thus the two systems are not complementary but contradictory. To adopt one is to reject the other.

Implications for Culture

The cultural implications of adopting Leong's synthesis would be immense. If personhood is illusory, human rights lose foundation. If morality is constructed by aggregates, justice becomes relative. If destiny is dissolution, hope collapses.

By contrast, Sayles's model grounds cultural life in the enduring dignity of the soul, the coherence of truth, and the hope of consummation. It provides the metaphysical architecture for law, morality, and art — all rooted in the Logos as the source of meaning.

Implications for Dialogue Between Science and Spirituality

Leong's synthesis exemplifies the dangers of "parallelomania" — forcing superficial similarities between distinct systems. The risk is that dialogue collapses into metaphor without substance. By contrast, Sayles shows that genuine dialogue is possible when science is seen as investigating the created order authored by the Logos. Physics uncovers patterns in the IΔF; theology names the Author.

Case Studies in Contrast

Case Study 1: Quantum Entanglement

- **Leong's Interpretation:** Entanglement is likened to *pratītya-samutpāda* (dependent origination). Just as particles remain interconnected across vast distances, all phenomena arise in relational dependence, with no intrinsic self. Leong interprets this as confirmation of Buddhist insights into interbeing (Nhat Hanh, 1996).
- **Sayles's Interpretation:** Entanglement, while real, is not evidence of emptiness but of informational authorship. In Sayles's framework, entanglement reflects the structuring of reality within the IΔF, authored by the Logos. Particles correlate across space not because they lack identity, but because they share an informational origin in divine authorship (*Veritas Confirmata*, 2023).
- **Critical Contrast:** Leong's reading erases individuality; Sayles's preserves both relationality and distinction. Entanglement in the Logos framework displays communion without collapse, mirroring Trinitarian ontology itself: unity with distinction.

Case Study 2: Consciousness and the Observer Effect

- **Leong's Interpretation:** Consciousness is analogous to wave-function collapse. *Vijñāna* is not an isolated self but a relational awareness that co-creates reality. The observer effect suggests that perception is ontologically constitutive.
- **Sayles's Interpretation:** Consciousness is not constitutive but participatory. The human mind does not collapse probability into being but perceives what the Logos has authored. Observation reveals, it does not create. Sayles stresses that human knowledge is analogical and covenantal (Van Til, 1955): finite creatures share in divine rationality, they do not replace it.
- **Critical Contrast:** Leong risks panpsychism and solipsism, where reality depends on perception. Sayles preserves realism:

consciousness is real, but reality does not depend on human awareness.

Case Study 3: Cosmology and the Quantum Vacuum

- **Leong's Interpretation:** The quantum vacuum is equated with *śūnyatā*. Just as particles emerge and annihilate in fluctuating fields, so phenomena arise from emptiness and return to it. This is likened to the cycle of *saṃsāra*.
- **Sayles's Interpretation:** The quantum vacuum, though strange, is still authored. Fluctuations are patterns within the IΔF, sustained by the Logos rather than emerging from nothing. The visible universe arises in information authored beyond materiality.
- **Critical Contrast:** Leong trivializes Buddhist soteriology by reducing Nirvana to equilibrium; Sayles preserves theological transcendence by grounding the vacuum in creation ex nihilo (Gen. 1:1).

Case Study 4: Human Identity

- **Leong's Interpretation:** Identity is illusory. The self is a bundle of aggregates, dissolving like quantum probabilities. Continuity is conventional, not ultimate.
- **Sayles's Interpretation:** Identity is authored. Each soul is uniquely created by God and endures beyond death. Personhood is eternal, reflecting the *imago Dei*, and is situated within the higher-dimensional reality of the Second Shamay.
- **Critical Contrast:** Leong's model undermines moral agency; Sayles's preserves it. In the Logos framework, justice, rights, and destiny retain coherence.

Case Study 5: Salvation and Destiny

- **Leong's Interpretation:** Salvation (*nirvāṇa*) is extinction into emptiness, likened to the return of energy to vacuum equilibrium. Liberation means dissolution.
- **Sayles's Interpretation:** Salvation is consummation in Christ, the Logos. The soul, preserved in the Second Shamay, is reconciled, redeemed, and glorified. Liberation means fulfillment, not extinction.
- **Critical Contrast:** Leong's model ends in negation; Sayles's in eternal hope.

Synthesis of Case Studies

These case studies show a consistent pattern:

- Leong collapses phenomena into emptiness, interdependence, and illusion.
- Sayles interprets the same realities as authored information, preserving both relation and identity.
- The Buddhist-quantum synthesis dissolves meaning; the Logos ontology grounds it.

Thus, where Leong's parallels are poetic but unstable, Sayles's metaphysic provides coherence, preserving the intelligibility of science and the dignity of the human person.

Toward a Logos-Centred Paradigm for Science and Spirituality

Having exposed the internal contradictions of Leong's Buddhist-quantum synthesis, and contrasted it with Sayles's Logos-centred metaphysic, it is necessary to sketch the contours of a constructive alternative. The Logos paradigm does not merely refute emptiness; it offers a comprehensive vision capable of integrating the insights of physics, philosophy, and theology without collapsing into incoherence.

The Logos as Ground of Rationality

The prologue of John's Gospel declares: *"In the beginning was the Word [Logos], and the Word was with God, and the Word was God... all things were made by him"* (John 1:1-3). The Logos is not a metaphor for order but the eternal Son, the divine rationality and authorship of all creation.

- **Scientific Implication:** The laws of physics are intelligible because they are authored by the Logos. The universe is not random flux but patterned information. Sayles captures this in the IΔF: a field of authored information that grounds quantum and cosmological coherence.
- **Philosophical Implication:** Rationality itself is possible because human minds, created in the *imago Dei*, participate analogically in the Logos. Reason is not autonomous (contra Enlightenment rationalism) nor illusory (contra Buddhist emptiness), but revelatory.

Information as Ontological Substrate

Sayles argues that reality is not fundamentally matter or energy but **information**. The IΔF represents the informational architecture of being, authored and sustained by God.

- **Against Emptiness:** Where Buddhism posits *śūnyatā*, Sayles posits information. Emptiness dissolves essence; information affirms authorship.
- **Against Reductionism:** Where materialism reduces mind to matter, Sayles elevates matter as expression of information. Consciousness is not epiphenomenal but a higher-dimensional participation in the Logos.

This move reinterprets entanglement, quantum fields, and cosmology not as evidence of emptiness but as signatures of informational coherence.

The Second Shamay and the Anthropology of Personhood

A Logos-centred paradigm must secure not only ontology but also a coherent anthropology. Sayles achieves this through his doctrine of the Second Shamay, the higher-dimensional realm created in the beginning (Gen. 1:1) as the domain in which human souls, authored in the *imago Dei* (Gen. 1:27), subsist and endure.

- **Unique authorship:** Each soul is directly created by God, not recycled from prior existence or reducible to impersonal processes. Personhood is authored, intentional, and distinct.
- **Enduring identity:** Because the soul is situated within an informational realm beyond material flux, its identity is preserved through death and into resurrection. Continuity is grounded not in aggregates or memory but in divine authorship.
- **Dignity and accountability:** Personhood is neither illusory nor dissolving. It is eternal, bearing moral responsibility before God and reflecting the dignity of the *imago Dei*.

This anthropology restores moral accountability, grounds human rights, and sustains eschatological hope. In sharp contrast to Leong's adoption of Buddhist *anātman*—where identity dissolves into contingent aggregates—Sayles's model safeguards the integrity of personal existence. It affirms that beyond death and beyond material dissolution, the soul endures in the Second Shamay, awaiting resurrection and consummation in Christ the Logos.

Christ as the Integrative Center

The Logos is not an abstraction but a Person: Christ, the eternal Word made flesh (John 1:14). All scientific and spiritual truths converge in Him.

- **Science:** Christ as Logos is the intelligible order underlying physics.
- **Philosophy:** Christ as Truth grounds rational discourse.
- **Theology:** Christ as Redeemer secures salvation and cosmic consummation.

Thus, where Leong's synthesis ends in negation, the Logos paradigm ends in communion: science and spirituality meet not in emptiness but in Christ.

Toward a Unified Vision

A Logos-centred paradigm offers a genuine **bridge** between science and spirituality without collapsing one into the other.

- **Science** investigates the patterns within the IΔF.
- **Philosophy** interprets those patterns as rational structures reflecting divine order.
- **Theology** identifies the Logos as the Author and Redeemer of these patterns.

In this way, the Logos paradigm accomplishes what Leong sought — an integrative framework — but without the contradictions of emptiness. It affirms interconnectedness while preserving personhood, unity while maintaining distinction, and transcendence while honoring immanence.

Conclusion — Between Emptiness and Logos

David Leong's *The Intersectionality Between Buddhism, Consciousness, and Quantum Physics* stands within a long tradition of attempts to harmonize ancient spiritual insight with modern science. By drawing parallels between *pratītya-samutpāda* and entanglement, *śūnyatā* and the quantum vacuum, *Dharmakāya* and non-locality, and *vijñāna* and the observer effect, he seeks to offer a holistic vision of reality as interdependent and non-dual. The effort is intellectually creative and rhetorically engaging. Yet, as this study has shown, the synthesis collapses under scrutiny.

Summary of Critique

Leong's framework suffers from three fatal flaws:

- **Category Confusion:** Metaphysical concepts (emptiness, Dharmakāya) are conflated with physical processes (vacuum, non-locality), collapsing metaphor into ontology.
- **Internal Contradictions:** The argument oscillates between emptiness and wholeness, between illusion and construction, without resolving the paradox.
- **Erasure of Personhood:** By adopting *anātman* and quantum indeterminacy, Leong dissolves identity and agency, undermining morality, dignity, and hope.

These flaws render the Buddhist-quantum synthesis philosophically incoherent, scientifically unstable, and theologically unsustainable.

Contrast with Sayles's Logos-Centred Metaphysic

In contrast, S. C. Sayles offers a coherent and comprehensive metaphysical framework that integrates science, philosophy, and theology without contradiction:

- **Ontology:** Reality is informational, authored in the IΔF by the Logos.
- **Epistemology:** Knowledge is covenantal participation in divine revelation, not autonomous construction.
- **Anthropology:** Each soul, uniquely authored by God in creation, endures beyond death and bears eternal dignity in the *imago Dei*. Its reality is secured within the higher-dimensional order of the Second Shamay, which provides the realm in which personal identity is preserved
- **Teleology:** Salvation is not extinction but consummation, union with Christ who is the Logos.

This system preserves the insights of interconnectedness while sustaining the irreducibility of personhood and the coherence of truth.

Philosophical and Theological Stakes

The stakes are clear:

- To adopt Leong's model is to embrace a system that collapses into paradox and nihilism, where identity is illusion and destiny is dissolution.
- To adopt Sayles's model is to affirm a Logos-centred universe, where science is intelligible, philosophy coherent, theology revelatory, and human life dignified and purposeful.

Toward a Logos-Centred Paradigm

The future of dialogue between science and spirituality does not lie in the conflation of Buddhism and physics but in the recovery of the Logos as the true bridge. Physics uncovers patterns of the IΔF; philosophy names their coherence; theology proclaims the Logos as their Author and Redeemer.

Between emptiness and Logos, only the Logos sustains rationality, preserves personhood, and fulfills hope. As Augustine declared, "*Our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee*" (*Confessions* I.i). Emptiness cannot satisfy that restlessness; only the Logos made flesh can.

References

- Aitchison, I. J. R. (1985). *Nothing's plenty: the vacuum in modern quantum field theory*. Contemporary Physics, 26(4), 333–391.
- Bohm, D. (2002). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge.
- Bouwmeester, D., & Zeilinger, A. (2000). *The Physics of Quantum Information*. Springer.
- Calvin, J. (1559/1960). *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Westminster Press.
- Collins, S. (1982). *Selfless Persons: Imagery and Thought in Theravāda Buddhism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leong, D. (2023). *The Intersectionality Between Buddhism, Consciousness, and Quantum Physics*. Charisma University.
- Milonni, P. W., & Shih, M.-L. (1991). *The quantum vacuum: An introduction to quantum electrodynamics*. Academic Press.
- Nāgārjuna. (c. 2nd century). *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

- Nhat Hanh, T. (1996). *Cultivating the Mind of Love*. Parallax Press.
- Nhat Hanh, T. (2020). *The Other Shore*. Parallax Press.
- Sayles, S. C. (2023). *The Recovery of the Soul: The Informational Architecture of the Mind*. Evolsiay Tulip.
- Sayles, S. C. (2023–25). *Veritas Confirmata* series. Evolsiay Tulip.
- Sayles, S. C. (2025). *CHRONOS: The Logos-Centred Chronosophy; KAIROS: The Logos-Centred Chronosophy; TIME AND TIMES: The Architecture of Time*. Evolsiay Tulip.
- Schaeffer, F. A. (1968). *The God Who Is There*. IVP.
- Van Til, C. (1955). *The Defense of the Faith*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.